



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,437	04/18/2001	Michael P. Etgen	RSW9-2001-0006-US1	3954

7590 12/05/2003

Gregory S. Bernabeo, Esq.
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

LEWIS, ADAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,437

Applicant(s)

ETGEN ET AL.

Examiner

Adam M. Lewis

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 10-13, 15-16, 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Paal et al. ("Paal", US# 5,263,134).

As per independent claim 1, Paal teaches a method for displaying in a display area a user-selected portion of an image, said method comprising the steps of:

- a) displaying a slider, said slider being variable in size according to user input (Paal, Figures 5 and 6) ;
- b) resizing said slider (Paal, Figure 6; col. 12, lines 13-49); and
- c) displaying a portion of said image, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said slider as resized in step b (Paal, Figure 6; col. 12, lines 13-49).

Independent claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Paal teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step (b) comprises the steps of:

(b1) accepting user input to resize the slider, said user input being accepted responsive to a user's manipulation of an input device (Paal, Figure 6; col. 12, lines 13-49); and

(b2) displaying said slider as resized (Paal, Figure 6; col. 12, lines 13-49).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Paal teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said user's manipulation of said input device of step (b1) comprises a click-and-drag technique (Paal, col. 12, lines 19-49).

Dependent claim 19 is similar to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Paal teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:

(d) displaying said image;

step (d) being performed before step (a) (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6; col. 12, lines 19-49).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Paal teaches the method of claim 4, wherein at least a portion of said slider is displayed superimposed over at least a portion of said image in step (a) (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Paal teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said slider is translatable over said image (Paal, Fig. 5; col. 10, lines 2-26).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Paal teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said portion of said image is displayed adjacent said image (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6).

Dependent claim 20 is similar to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, Paal teaches the method of claim 7, wherein said portion of said image is displayed enlarged relative to said image (Paal, Fig. 5-6; col. 2, lines 22-34).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 4, Paal teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising the steps of:

(e) displaying a second slider, said second slider cooperating with said slider to define said portion of said image, said second slider being variable in size according to user input (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6);

wherein said portion of said image is defined responsive to said user's resizing of said slider or said second slider (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6).

Dependent claims 22 and 24 are similar in scope to claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Paal teaches the method of claim 11, wherein at least a portion of said second slider is displayed superimposed over at least a portion of said image (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Paal teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said slider and said second slider cooperate to define said portion of said image as the intersection of said slider and said second slider (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6; col. 10, lines 2-26; col. 12, lines 19-49).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Paal teaches the graphical user interface of claim 15, wherein resizing of said slider causes the portion of the data file displayed as an image in the display area to change (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6; col. 12, lines 19-49).

As per independent claim 18, Paal teaches a method for displaying in a display area a user-selected portion of an image, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) displaying an image (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6);

(b) displaying at least a portion of a slider superimposed over at least a portion of said image to define a first portion of said image, said slider being variable in size according to user input (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6; col. 12, lines 19-49);

(c) displaying said first portion of said image (Paal, Fig. 5 and 6);

(d) accepting user input to resize said slider (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 19-49);

and

(e) displaying a second portion of said image, said second portion of said image being defined by said resized slider (Paal, Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 19-49).

Independent claims 21 and 23 are similar in scope to claim 18 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claims 1, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Perry ("Perry", US# 5,553,225).

As per independent claim 1, Perry teaches a method for displaying in a display area a user-selected portion of an image, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) displaying a slider, said slider being variable in size according to user input (Perry, Figs. 2 and 4-6; col. 4, lines 30-50);

(b) resizing said slider (Perry, Figs. 2 and 4-6; col. 4, lines 30-50); and

(c) displaying a portion of said image, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said slider as resized in step (b) (Perry, Figs. 2 and 4-6; col. 4, lines 5-29).

Independent claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, Perry teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said slider comprises a scroll box of a scroll bar (Perry, Figs. 2 and 4-6; col. 4, lines 5-29).

Dependent claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paar in view of Moran et al. ("Moran", US# 5,717,869).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Paar fails to teach using a visual momentum technique to relate the portion of the image to the image. Moran teaches the relationship between the overview of a file area and the focused file area. This relationship is made visually apparent by arms which extend from the ends of the focus segment to the ends of the focus time track area (Moran, Fig. 5; col. 20, lines 33-52).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the extension arms of Moran in the data display system of Paar to produce a visual momentum technique because it would help provide a more clear correlation between the small image and the large image. This increased correlation would make the system more user friendly and efficient because the user would always have a more clear view of what portion of the overall image he or she was considering.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Santos (US# 4,837,635) teaches a scanning system in which a portion of a preview scan image of a picture displaced on a screen is selected and a corresponding portion of the picture is scanned in a final scan.

Callahan et al. (US# 4,982,345) teaches an interactive computer graphics display system processing method for identifying an operator selected displayed object.

Yanker (US# 5,187,776) teaches an image editor zoom function.

Tamura et al. (US# 5,596,689) teaches a figure processing with magnification of designated portion of display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M. Lewis whose telephone number is 703-305-0720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-4:30, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

al

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100